UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Woodrow Wilson: Apostle of American Democracy - - *David Gittleman*

The Free Mind Confronts Religion - - - - - - - - - - - - *Eugene Kreves*

Can the United Nations Prevent War? - - - - - *Bhabes Chandra Chaudhuri*

The Ethical Culture Movement - *Leo Hirsch*

The New Piety - - *George Lawrence Parker*

Western Conference News

VOLUME CXLII No. 4

Chicago, November-December, 1956

PRICE TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Bimonthly *Subscription $1.50*

Except During July-August *Single Copies 25 cents*

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter October 7, 1952, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879."

CURTIS W. REESE, *Editor*

CONTRIBUTORS

Bhabes Chandra Chaudhuri: Resident of India.

David Gittleman: Retired civil service employe, and free-lance writer.

Leo Hirsch: Free-lance writer and lecturer.

Eugene Kreves: Minister of DuPage County Unitarian Fellowship in Naperville, Illinois.

George Lawrence Parker: Formerly, minister of Unitarian Churches in Toledo, Ohio, and Duxbury, Massachusetts.

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL—Curtis W. Reese 51

ARTICLES—

Woodrow Wilson: Apostle of American Democracy —David Gittleman 52

The Free Mind Confronts Religion—Eugene Kreves 55

Can the United Nations Prevent War? —Bhabes Chandra Chaudhuri 57

The Ethical Culture Movement—Leo Hirsch 59

The New Piety—George Lawrence Parker 62

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS 63

THE FIELD—

Racial Discrimination in Cleveland Trade School —*ACLU Bulletin* 50

THE FIELD

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion"

Racial Discrimination in Cleveland Trade School

The Cleveland Trade School, supported by city, state, and federal funds, conducts apprentice-training programs for a number of building trades in which the union, employer, school board, and city cooperate. Applicants are screened by a labor-management committee.

In a letter to the Board, the OCLU, an affiliate of the American Civil Liberties Union, charged that qualified Negro applicants are excluded from certain training programs due to the discriminatory practices of some building trade unions.

Directing its attack against Local 38 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, the OCLU said that the local excludes Negroes from union membership and this "has resulted in no Negroes being admitted to the Cleveland Trade School to participate in that part of the program devoted to training electricians."

While disclaiming any desire to dictate the terms and conditions which a labor union establishes as prerequisites to union membership, the OCLU declared that it "strongly and unequivocally believes that no public body should permit a labor union to impose its conditions . . . on a publicly-supported institution."

The case first arose when Theodore Pinkston charged last Spring before Cleveland's Community Relations Board that he was denied full membership in Local 38.

As a result of the protest by the OCLU, the Cleveland Board of Education formally warned the IBEW local that unless that union abandons its discriminatory practices its apprentice-training program would be cut off. Subsequently the Board approved a resolution requiring all unions, employers, and joint labor-management apprentice-training committees to file a statement with the Board stating that they do not discriminate against Negroes. The resolution also made eligibility for apprentice training the responsibility of the Board, with the details for the admission procedure to be developed by the Cleveland school superintendent before the next school semester.

—*ACLU Bulletin.*

UNITY

Volume CXLII NOVEMBER-DECEMBER, 1956 No. 4

EDITORIAL

The messiest situation in the world today appears to be in the Middle East. And despite our role in bringing about this situation, we have no discernible and dependable policy for meeting it. After giving Nasser every reason to believe that we would finance the building of the Aswan Dam, we suddenly withdrew our offer. In a fit of rage Nasser then nationalized the Suez Canal. England and France, with encouragement from us, attempted to secure an international agreement for the operation of the Canal. We then suddenly left England, France, and their associates to handle the situation without any firm support from us. After having virtually created the State of Israel, we did nothing or next to nothing to see that Egypt obeyed a United Nations mandate that Israel's ships have access to the Suez Canal. We did nothing to stop Egyptian raids into Israeli territory; nothing to stop Nasser's inflammatory campaign to unite the Arab States for a war of extermination of Israel, a state created by the United Nations under United States leadership; and nothing to stop the building up of Egyptian forces in the Sinai desert for the purpose of making war on Israel. When Israel, after the greatest and prolonged provocation, waged a successful attack on Egyptian forces in the Sinai Peninsula, we united with Nasser and the Soviet Union in urging the United Nations to condemn Israel. When England and France, under great provocation over the Suez Canal dispute, invaded Egypt, we again united with Nasser and the Soviet Union in urging the United Nations to condemn England and France, two of our strongest and most faithful Allies. I am not attempting to justify Israel, England, and France in their invasion of Egyptian territory. The point I am trying to make is that we had no policy with which to meet the crisis. If we had had a constructive policy and had put it into effect, it would have made it less likely that Israel, England, and France would have thought it necessary to invade Egyptian territory. Granted the situation that existed by the time these issues came before the United Nations, it may be that our catch-as-catch-can policy was the best that we could do. It may even be that we won some moral credit with the uncommitted countries. But for this credit we paid a heavy price in strained relations with our strongest Allies, and in revealing to the whole world that we have no coherent and dependable foreign policy. It is now high time that we formulated a foreign policy involving our friendly relationship to the emerging national movements in Africa and Asia; our friendly attitude toward the Titoist type of Communist Governments that break away from Soviet domination; and our determination to do more than talk when action is necessary to bring down a dictator such as Nasser and his like wherever they arise.

Curtis W. Reese.

Woodrow Wilson: Apostle of American Democracy *

DAVID GITTLEMAN

"The brotherhood of mankind must no longer be a fair but empty phrase; it must be given a structure of force and reality. The nations must realize their common life and effect a workable partnership to secure that life against the aggressions of autocratic and self-pleasing power."

—Woodrow Wilson, Message to the Russian Government, June 8, 1917.

Woodrow Wilson, educator, author, statesman and eloquent dreamer, was a man of integrity, industry, and courage. He, too, aimed to conquer anger with kindness, evil with good, falsehood with truth, in the light of reason and human experience. As a private citizen, he was bold, being swayed by convictions based on study which made him champion of political, industrial, and social democracy at home. He loved his country; but this love did not exclude a passionate love for humanity the world over. A good party man, he placed the interests of the country above partisanship when basic principles were involved. He said:

> I have been bred in the Democratic Party. I love the Democratic Party; but I love America a great deal more than I love the Democratic Party; and when the Democratic Party thinks that it is an end in itself, then I rise up and dissent. (January 8, 1915.)

His warning against mob rule has timely significance:

> I say plainly that every American who takes part in the action of a mob or gives it any sort of countenance is no true son of this great democracy, but its betrayer. How shall we commend democracy to the acceptance of other peoples, if we disgrace our own by proving that it is after all no protection to the weak? (July 26, 1918.)

The United States is of necessity the sample democracy of the world, and the triumph of democracy depends upon its success. As a reformer, his platform was to the point, full of common sense and workable. The only way to keep men from agitating against grievances, he maintained, is to remove the grievances. And in America there is but one way by which great reforms can be accomplished and the relief sought by classes obtained, and that is through the orderly processes of representative government. Those who would propose any other method of reform are enemies of this country. (Message to Senate, December 2, 1919.) In particular, he aimed for the advancement of human conditions of labor for men, women, and children; but that was to be accomplished upon the basis of equality of rights, since mankind is looking now for freedom of life, not for equipoises of power. He stressed upright leadership and was a bitter foe of all dictatorship. "I am not afraid of a knave," he said. "I am not afraid of a rascal. I am afraid of a strong man who is wrong, and whose wrong thinking can be impressed upon other persons by his own force of character and force of speech." (*The New Freedom.*)

It was Wilson who reminded the joint session of Congress that "property can be paid for; the lives of peaceful and innocent people cannot be." (April 2, 1917.) Next to freedom and justice, there is nothing more precious than human life. He felt that civilization has a spiritual inheritance, breathing freedom and tolerance. He saw progress in diversity. He aimed to set the leaders of men morally aright; for he observed them acting the part of the Sorcerer's Apprentice, who failed to stop the flood a cunning art had revealed to him. The task of a statesman in our day, Wilson said, is analogous to the task of a surgeon. There is a great deal that is necessary to be cut out of modern life, yet we must be very careful not to injure any of the sound tissue in cutting out. (June 4, 1912.) He felt that an ethical national and world leadership would bring class strife and a warring mankind (ever enmeshed in fears and passions and prejudices) to a Democracy Triumphant. He trusted in the power of an unfettered public opinion, daring and enlightened. He believed in the policy of live and let live; and he was in possession of a native talent to crystallize his ideas in the classroom and on the platform. "It is for this," said Wilson, "that we love democracy: for the emphasis it puts on character; for its tendency to exalt the purposes of the average man to some high level of endeavor; for its just principles of common assent in matters in which all are concerned; for its ideals of duty and its sense of brotherhood." (*Atlantic Monthly,* March 1901.) What was the man's background?

Born and reared in the South, son of a devout Presbyterian scholar and minister, Woodrow Wilson saw the physical ravages left by the Civil War (he was already a sensitive lad eight years old when Lincoln was shot); and he actually observed from close hand the ramifications—psychological, economic, social and political—that plagued the country after the war. A graduate of law, he gave up law practice at the age of twenty-seven and went to Johns Hopkins University, where he received his Ph.D. at the age of thirty. At thiry-four, he became professor of jurisprudence and political economy at Princeton, his alma mater, and became its president at the age of forty. His progressive ideas began to make history. He introduced the now famous *preceptorial system,* stressing intellectual incentive by intimate tutoring and honor courses. He also labored (unsuccessfully) for the *quad plan,* which would coordinate the social and intellectual life of the student body on the campus with the principles of applied democracy, minus bias. Early in his career as teacher, he made it clear that his aim was to help men, not to delude them; for it was his conviction that the object of liberal training is not learning, but discipline and the enlightenment of the mind; and a college education should give our young men and women an insight into the things of the mind and of the spirit, a sense of having lived and formed their friendships amidst the gardens of the mind where grows the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.

In capsule form, for the world at large Wilson offered a formula based upon the twin-rock of Liberty and Justice; and he held that it was the business of civilization to get together by discussion and not by fighting; that there could be no other foundation for

*December 1956 marks the 100th anniversary of Woodrow Wilson's birth.

peace than is laid in justice without aggression; that if the world is to remain a body of friends it must have the means of friendship, the means of friendly intercourse, the means of constant watchfulness over the common interest. He fervently believed that the only force that outlasts all others and is finally triumphant is the moral judgment of mankind—a judgment that is always opposed to provocations of aggressors and can never condone policies leading to acts brutal, cowardly, ignoble, and dishonorable. Permanent peace, he held, can grow in only one soil. That is the soil of actual good will, and good will cannot exist without mutual comprehension. The firm basis of government, Wilson taught, is justice, not pity. And no matter where, when, and how the man reacted, his motive always reverted to this cardinal principle: justice on the college campus, justice among the conflicting interests stirring the ire of his fellow citizens at home, justice in the international arena among the nations of the world. To him, it was manifest that progressive Government has a vital organic function to perform. Government should serve society, by no means dominate it. The State exists for the sake of society, not society for the sake of the State.

With these mature ideas, at the age of fifty-four, Wilson was elected Governor of the State of New Jersey, where he began to push legislation for the welfare of all the people. Politics he divorced from selfishness. Politics he considered to be the science of the ordered progress of society, along the lines of greatest usefulness and convenience to itself. Material values were of import as long as they stood for spiritual and moral advancement. At all times, he insisted, men must distinguish between right and wrong and be aware of responsibility for wrongdoing. His Corrupt Practices Act, Employers' Liability Act, and Primary Election Law attracted the attention of the people throughout the forty-eight states. Full recognition and reward came to him in the year 1912, when at the age of fifty-six he was elected President of the United States. He believed in free enterprise, for the reason that he wished to keep "independent energy alive," and signed the Clayton Anti-Trust Act.

A staunch believer in the good-neighbor policy, Wilson was forced, by a sense of harsh reality, to dispatch General Pershing into Mexico (1916) to stop Villa's guerrilla activities. But the real test of statesmanship came with the sinking of the *Lusitania* (May 7, 1915), resulting in the loss of more than one thousand lives, including more than a hundred American citizens.

This was followed by the brutal sinkings of the *Arabic* and *Sussex*. The ruthless submarine warfare executed by the military autocracy of imperial Germany could not proceed unchallenged. There comes a time when patience does cease to be a virtue. It was not merely a question of legal rights and security for neutral countries, but a question of national honor and survival. At this point of his career, Wilson's fruitless ambition was to keep America neutral as a ready mediator. "It would be a calamity to the world at large," he wrote to Colonel House on August 21, 1915, "if we should be actively drawn into the conflict and so deprived of all disinterested influence over the settlement." But he accepted the challenge in the daring spirit of his own words, uttered upon his election as President (words destined to be known some day as a Second Gettysburg Address), when he said:

> This is not a day of triumph; it is a day of dedication. Here muster not the forces of party, but the forces of humanity. Men's hearts wait upon us; men's lives hang in the balance; men's hopes call upon us to say what we will do. Who shall live up to the great trust? Who dares fail to try? I summon all honest men, all patriotic, all forward-looking men to my side. God helping me, I will not fail them, if they will but counsel and sustain me! (Inaugural Address, March 4, 1913.)

In 1916, as peace-crusader, Wilson was reelected President. On January 22, 1917, he still insisted upon a peace without victory. But he was no naive theorist. His feet were firmly on the ground. On April 2, 1917, he appeared before Congress in the role of practical dreamer and champion in defense of world freedom and world democracy, asking for a declaration of war to secure lasting peace and for a world organization that would make war in the future impossible. This nation, he explained, entered the great war to vindicate its own rights and to protect and preserve free government. It went into the war to make an end of militarism, to furnish guaranties to weak nations, and to make a just and lasting peace. "This in my opinion," he declared, "is to be the great privilege of the democracy of the United States: to show that it can lead the way in the solution of the great social and industrial problems of our time, and lead the way to a happy, settled order of life as well as to political liberty." (Letter to Jackson Day Dinner, January 8, 1920.) As a practical statesman and scholar, he let it be known that to conquer with arms is to make only a temporary conquest; to conquer the world by earning its esteem is to make permanent conquest.

Wilson was persuaded that our civilization cannot survive materially unless it be redeemed spiritually; that leadership can be faulty; that only those who actually do the suffering can feel and see, or, as he put it in his New York address (March 4, 1919), "those against whom wrong is wrought know how desirable is the right of the righteous." Hence his plea that peace should rest upon the rights of peoples, not the rights of governments—the rights of peoples great and small, weak and powerful—their equal right to freedom and security and self-government, and to a participation upon fair terms in the economic opportunities of the world. Wilson took our entrance into World War I as a challenge to his personal integrity. "I would consider myself recreant to every mother and father, every wife and sweetheart in this country, if I consented to the ending of this war without a guaranty that there would be no other." (September 8, 1919.) In his Message to Congress (February 11, 1918), he indicated how terribly determined and proud he could be as an American and as a lover of mankind:

> We are indomitable in our power of independent action and can in no circumstances consent to live in a world governed by intrigue and force. We believe that our own desire for a new international order under which reason and justice and the common interests of mankind shall prevail is the desire of enlightened men everywhere. Without that new world order, the world will be without peace, and human life will lack tolerable conditions of existence and development. Having set our hand to the task of achieving it, we shall not turn back.

Crossing his sixty-first birthday, the visionary returned to his dream-model with the enunciation of the Fourteen Points (January 8, 1918), thus making the Armistice of November 11, 1918, possible, with the League of Nations Covenant in actual print and on the agenda for the statesmen of the world to work on. As

an historian, earlier in his career, Wilson had already drawn up his blueprints. America, he lectured, has all along claimed the distinction of setting this example to the civilized world: that men were to think of one another, that governments were to be set up for the service of the people, that men were to be judged by these moral standards which pay no regard to rank or birth or conditions, but which assess every man according to his single and individual value. (May 7, 1911.) In truth, he insisted, we are at the beginning of an age in which it will be insisted that the same standards of conduct and of responsibility for wrong done shall be observed among nations and their governments that are observed among the individual citizens of civilized states. (To Congress, April 2, 1917.)

Woodrow Wilson knew that the only triumphant ideas in this world are the ideas that are organized for battle. He knew that eternal vigilance must be the price of liberty and all good things men crave. He knew that man's salvation lies in the wielding of a moral intelligence, which is the creative force motivated by good will and aiming for that social order where equity, justice, and abiding peace are welcome and actually made possible to take root and to spread. With this philosophy as a background, the President actually believed that he was fighting a war that would make the world safe for democracy, with no annexations, no commercial exploitation, and with open diplomacy, self-determination, and absolute equality among all peoples. He was taken to be the Messiah come to save the world from the terrors of future wars; and upon his arrival in devastated Europe for the Peace Conference (1918), wherever he went he was hailed as a savior by the common people, being awarded later the Nobel Peace Prize. His plan—A Utopia—was simple: A family of free nations, held together voluntarily by the moral ties of an identity of praiseworthy interests and aspirations, by understanding and mutual aid, under the banner of Liberty and Justice. To Wilson, that was the logical, the legitimate, workable, and timely scheme to heal mankind's wounds and save our very future from the consequences of ignorance, apathy, and ill will of a faulty leadership.

With the eye of an historian, who wrote the great Story of the American People, keeping fresh in his mind the lessons of the War for Independence and the Civil War, he elucidated: Revolutions do not spring up over night. Revolutions, he said, come from the long suppression of the human spirit. Revolutions come because men know that they have rights and that they are disregarded. (September 4, 1919.) He valiantly maintained that the right of labor to live in peace and comfort must be recognized by governments, and America should be the first to lay the foundation stones upon which industrial peace shall be built. The road to economic and social reform in America is the straight road of justice to all classes and conditions of men. (Message to the Senate, December 2, 1919.) Anxious that his own beloved America should set the example, he stressed the obvious—that he desired to see justice, righteousness, fairness, and humanity displayed in all the laws of the United States. "Justice is what we want, not patronage and condescension and pitiful helpfulness. I for one do not care to live in a country called free even under kind masters. I prefer to live under no masters at all." *(The New Freedom.)*

Wilson, the statesman, stood for the humanization of human relationship, where individual, social and international ethics inseparably linked humanity into a harmonious and creative whole. His remark at Richmond (February 1, 1912) stamps the true character of the man: America's economic supremacy, he declared, depends upon the moral character and the resilient hopefulness of our workman. This theme was repeated seven years later, when he pleaded for "a full recognition of the right of those who work, in whatever rank, to participate in some organic way in every decision which directly affects their welfare or the part they are to play in industry." (Message to Congress, May 20, 1919.) When a crisis was confronted, Wilson braved the battle. We do not stand off and see murder done, cries the apostle of American democracy. We do not profess to be the champions of liberty and then consent to see liberty destroyed. (September 4, 1919.) He dared to act in fulfilment of his dream. Three years before the foregoing declaration was made, he already notified the would-be aggressors that we are champions of the rights of mankind. We are not only ready to cooperate, but we are ready to fight against any aggression, whether from without or from within. We are ready to fight for our rights when those rights are coincident with the rights of man and humanity. (Arlington, May 30, 1916.)

But "the weary weight of this unintelligible world" took its toll and a "spiritual sclerosis" revealed its ugly symptoms. The cold and brutal realities of organized irresponsibility and political maneuverings brought about a stalemate in the intellectual and spiritual doing of an entire post-war generation. Wilson, who spoke the mind of suffering humanity and was its very living conscience, had failed, like so many sages and prophets had failed and suffered before him. His awakening was most painful and indeed fatal. The pure idealism, integrity, and aspirations of the American President were trapped by the passions and greed and selfishness of Old World diplomacy abroad and partisan recriminations at home. Before reaching his sixty-third birthday, his strength gave way under the terrific tension of a campaign of public enlightenment which he undertook upon his return to the States. "Alas," summarizes Wilson's co-worker at the Peace Conference, Paul-Boncour, former Premier of France, "his noble candor was scorned at the diplomatic tables. His dream was mutilated. He returned to his own country only to see his proposals rejected by his own countrymen. He died, like King Lear, persecuted by his own daughters." (*New York Times,* January 11, 1956.) The caveman won and the catastrophic holocaust of World War II and Korea was the inevitable consequence.

Wilson was stricken in the very midst of his campaign (1919), from which he never fully recovered. The ill-fated statesman thus summed up the climactic tragedy of his personal career: "There is little for the great part of the history of the world except the bitter tears of pity and the hot tears of wrath." (September 18, 1919.) He tasted more than his share of both, bitter tears of pity and hot tears of wrath. The recurring follies and crimes of man go beyond the boundaries of nations, above the realm of reason, certainly above the dictates of true justice. On Sunday, February 3, 1924, having passed his sixty-seventh birthday, Woodrow Wilson died in his sleep, leaving us, the living, to carry on. The man failed, but his vision was not conquered; nor was his voice silenced. For, as President Eisenhower stated in his proclamation urging a wider participation in observing the 100th

anniversary of the birth of our twenty-eighth President, "the leader of World War I gave to this nation and to the world a concept of peace based on justice and freedom and supported by the brotherhood of man."

The greatness of a man is judged by the undying timeliness of his message. Woodrow Wilson veered steadily toward freedom married to responsibility. He sought the free development of the individual and the group, which was to be attained by means of education, gradual evolution, and voluntary association; equality of opportunity and respect granted to all. His civic aspirations and activities inspired social justice and enjoyment of civilized and moral life. As a scholar, philosopher, and statesman, he aimed toward ordered human cooperative living and a world peace erected upon the appreciation of the dignity of man and the sacredness of human life the world over. Thus the practical dreamer and apostle of American democracy was a lighthouse in a foggy world, one who looked at his fellow Americans, to use his own words, as custodians of the spirit of righteousness, of the spirit of equal-handed justice, of the spirit of hope which believes in the perfectibility of the law with the perfectibility of human life itself. (October 20, 1914.)

Like the incorrigible George Bernard Shaw and the late H. L. Mencken, though in his own chosen domain of scholarship and moral statesmanship, Wilson was "a healthy poker to the intellectual fires of his age," destined to a prominent niche in Humanity's Hall of Fame. He had a grand vision and a vital message for our twentieth century. He was destined to fail, because he was so sincere in his professions and so far ahead of his fellow men. Our hero himself left us a perfect appraisal and scholarly summation on the philosophy of man's place in nature:

> There are some laws [wrote Wilson in *When a Man Comes to Himself,* published in 1915] which govern a man's awakening to know himself and the right part to play. A man *is* the part he plays among his fellows. He is not isolated; he cannot be. His life is made up of the relations he bears to others—is made or marred by those relations, guided by them, judged by them, expressed in them. There is nothing else upon which he can spend his spirit—nothing else that we can see. It is by these he gets his spiritual growth; it is by these we see his character revealed, his purpose and his gifts. . . . It is unselfish action, growing slowly into the high habit of devotion, and, at last, it may be into a sort of consecration, that teaches a man the wide meaning of life.

And Woodrow Wilson's life *was* a life of unselfish action, grown fully into the high habit of devotion and consecration, dedicated to a humaner world of tomorrow, for America to play the leading role. It was his patriotic faith that America has lifted high the light which will shine unto all generations and guide the feet of mankind to the goal of justice and liberty and peace. A rededication to these same principles and the application in daily life of this very faith is the finest tribute we can pay to the memory of the man, and the best service we can offer to our own country and to humanity at large, of which we have now learned we are an inseparable part. As Arthur Krock, Washington columnist of the *New York Times,* indicated in his talk at Wilson's birthplace (*Times,* April 27, 1956), the twenty-eighth President of the United States was "the world statesman whose voice stirred the world with the dearest aspiration of men of good will, which is peace on earth, and was the master architect of the only plan by which it can be made durable."

The Free Mind Confronts Religion

EUGENE KREVES

In every generation the uninhibited thinker has been looked upon with suspicion and disfavor. It is our present hope that we have moved into the period of the free mind with its attendant joys and responsibilities.

Despite the popular retreat into neo-orthodoxy we will see once more the emergence of the free mind which will deal with religious questions and social situations, casting aside the rule of priest, church, pious politicians and rejecting the despotism of social conformity. The time will come again when the spirit of freedom in religion and politics will be manifested. Men simply need reassurance that their rational nature is to be trusted. The people will awaken from the dark age of our time and will wonder why they did not question the wisdom of those who led them on a return to religious orthodoxy and social conformity.

During the present period of history men have by and large accepted and believed what the Church and the clergy have proposed . . . that the wars and depressions of the recent past came because men turned away from God in His infinite wisdom and tried to "go-it-alone." The accepted definition of a Christian is one who "believes that man turned away from God and that this is original sin." The do-it-yourself trend is considered irreligious when it is applied to religion or philosophy.

Moreover, in the present age, as we have succumbed to the orthodox clergy and have allowed ourselves to be led along the road to religious orthodoxy, we have allowed our lack of faith in ourselves to permit us to be pressured into a betrayal (vocal or silent) of our American democratic heritage. The hysteria has engulfed liberals. On rare occasions we find a few brave souls who stand up to the irresponsible power of religious and political tyranny. In each generation those who worship Truth, Goodness, and Beauty must be prepared to play the role of Protestant and Dissenter, Heretic and Martyr.

In an earlier age the human mind was subjected to gross superstitions and compelled to worship the toenail of an apostle, a bone of St. Peter or Paul, or a purported piece of the Cross on which Jesus was crucified. Traces of this idolatry linger in our midst, but we are enslaved today by a pernicious lack of faith in our fellow men and in ourselves. We have allowed our minds to be bound by the assumption that every man is disloyal to his nation unless he is proved innocent of subversion. We have seen the time arrive when Congressional committees investigating subversion seem to have no knowledge of, or respect for, the Bill of Rights. Indeed, the most potent amendments are used as traps to catch desirable victims.

Society will not always remain in this state. It is our religious duty to hasten the evolution of society to

the dawn of an enlightened social conscience. The religious and political dissenters of the past have not lived in vain. They lived magnificently but not easily. They were moved by great convictions, yet suffered enormous persecutions.

Men today talk as though they were free; and if we were to ask a conventional Protestant if he were free, he would regard us with amazement, not realizing that he has allowed the church to bind his mind and that he has required or permitted a minister or priest to do his thinking on religion for him. In our liberal churches I trust this is not true and that in these dedicated fellowships men and women find a new intellectual life and a reverent questing spirit. Here you may think freely and wisely, no longer under any compulsion to keep your doubts to yourself, free to share your convictions with others. Other churches may talk of freedom, but they are shocked by persons who practice it. It is quite impossible to shock a genuine liberal. Liberal religion is radical to the utmost degree, but its basic nature is honest, reverently paying homage to the Truth. Every new and old doctrine is questioned, and every creed is probed for its underlying grains of fact. No creed is sacred and beyond examination, not even the creed of the so-called "American Way of Life."

As I read *I. F. Stone's Weekly,* in which he described the atmosphere of the Soviet Union, I was impressed with how closely it resembled the social atmosphere in this nation when Joe McCarthy was in his heyday. Let us take care that in our time the principle of the free mind which we honor operates in politics as well as in religion. In a democracy characterized by numerous pressure groups, it is the depths of poor patriotism to allow any one group to rule over all the others. It is now popular to think that business has some special prerogative to assume control of the administration of government. As the religious liberals of yesteryear fought against the oppression of a totalitarian church and founded free churches, we in our day must resist any monistic interpretation of the State. Government of, by, and for the people remains our religious duty as well as our political ideal.

In ultimate questions the free mind recognizes that one's religion is one's own responsibility, and when you face life and finally death, it is better to face it with your own religion than with the untested answers which someone else has given you with orders that you are not to doubt their truth. No church or priest can minister to the free mind. Your religion is a matter of your relationship with all of Nature. You must create it by your own endeavor. In a liberal church you subject yourself to a broad flow of profound ideas, and according to your evolving vision you take and you reject, and your authority is not the Church nor holy tradition, it is your own rational nature common to all men. What outrages intelligence and violates the aspirations of your spirit destroys the divinity of your character.

Let others commit mental suicide by returning to the paths of orthodox religion. They have their reward! Gullibility and credulity grant a false sense of assurance.

We must recognize that the Roman Catholic Church and the Protestant churches by and large belong to the past, have little relationship with the present and offer little real hope for the future of mankind. There are a great many indications that we are in the midst of a growing revolution in thought which is gradually setting aside as erroneous the world view of Christendom and its psychology as well. The time is coming and in some areas is now here when men are prepared to relate their lives to a true Catholic Church of Humanity characterized by the vigorous spirit of Protestant Dissent to all that harms humanity.

The free mind moves irresistibly to such a church, demands it, rejects creeds, dogmas, slogans, shibboleths, and clichés, asks of its ministry honesty, integrity, the sharing of doubts, and the inspiration of uplifting convictions.

What if our generation has lost faith in itself and in putting its hand to the plow of liberalism has looked back? This has happened in every age. We must bear in mind that we have been blessed with the scientific spirit. There is no evidence that this will be surrendered. We have a technological base which is well-rooted in history. We will not disown that!

More than 100 years ago a Universalist minister, Dr. Thayer, said:

> What if a few clergymen of Protestant faith return to the bosom of the Roman Church. The locomotive and telegraph and printing-press and newspapers, science, philosophy, the Bible, the right of interpretation, free discussion . . . these are not going back to Rome. Let the ministers gather their dusty sermons and travel back through the centuries to the feet of the Holy Father, and kiss his great toe, if they will; the people are not going to do any such thing. The world will go forward, must go forward—that is its God-appointed destiny.

The free mind working in and through the free liberal church for the emancipation and release from bondage of all minds, moves on confidently into the future. We have no time to whine about our supposed sinful nature and to prostrate ourselves abjectly before the universe, begging its mercy. Our task as free minds is to create active sincere workers for a finer civilization than has yet been achieved. We demand a church devoted not to the perpetuation of a theology, but to the welfare of humanity, and we do not deem the two identical.

The Church has feared the free mind, has labored to shackle it, has considered the spirit of freedom as opposed to the spirit of religion. In fighting the free mind the Church has made its greatest mistake. It has driven its finest thinkers into open rebellion and has persecuted them unto death. It has disdained discussion and called for intellectual conformity to a creed or set of principles. It has allowed a hierarchy of petty minds ruled by opportunism to set its standards of truth and goodness. When on occasion a great mind finds its way into that hierarchy, it is unable to break through the stifling mediocrity and bring the Church to heights of moral grandeur and intellectual prominence. Now Protestantism is characterized by ecumenicity and draws itself together as a dying spider while Catholicism retreats into itself fenced largely by new parochial dogmas. Even liberals falter before the great opportunity. Now is the time for a great new church of universal ideals and intellectual freedom. What is good in orthodoxy cannot die. It will survive in purified form, but the old forms and faiths are passing. It may be that Protestant Christendom has served its purpose. It has given birth in Christendom to the spirit of freedom. It may look upon its offspring with loathing, but it dare not deny paternity. No longer can the world be kept back from freedom in a humanist setting. Lenin, Mussolini, and Hitler recognized the inadequacies of orthodox religion and sought to create a humanist social order. Their remedy was worse than the disease. It is our task to work for a religious Humanism which is universal in its values and unitarian in its humanitarian emphasis. Men

are sick of war and frightened by aggressive nationalism and know not where to turn. To the blessed faith of a reverent religious Humanism they must come sooner or later.

This liberal faith dealing with human necessity in a reverent spirit, asking man to dedicate himself to work for a newer and better social order will not always be resisted successfully. Church and State may oppose such a faith and as vested interests may deem it heretical or subversive. Business may cry that religion should content itself with the soul's relation to God, but the terrible marching of events moves man onward, and man must choose between a religion of democracy and a social order of feudalism followed by disaster.

The evolution of the free mind has brought liberals to the point of unacknowledged leadership. As religious liberals we have a responsibility to discharge to this generation and to posterity. We are lights set upon a hill and cannot be hidden. As free minds we will participate in the search for knowledge, for social reform, and in all movements for social betterment.

Life has brought us forth to serve this purpose and in the fulfillment of it is the real meaning of life, the enlightenment and elevation and refinement of humanity.

Can the United Nations Prevent War?

BHABES CHANDRA CHAUDHURI

The vital question of the hour is whether the United Nations can stop great wars: the wars between the Big Powers which now threaten to destroy our civilization. The men who drafted the Charter of the United Nations at San Francisco hoped that this question would never be asked.

Elated with victory, they believed that the Big Powers would stand together in peace, as in war, to enforce the moral, cultural, and legal ordering of the world. They perhaps felt, in the words of the United States Secretary of State at the time, "that the maintenance of peace, and not merely its restoration, depends primarily upon the unity of the Great Powers." And they wrote the Charter of the United Nations on this assumption. That is why they insisted that the Security Council should be able to make no important decision without the unanimous votes of its five permanent members or, in other words, that is why they gave the right of veto to each of the Great Powers.

In the light of what has happened so far, does this not appear as a great blunder? Yet it is doubtful as to whether the Charter would have been very different even if the statesmen of the Great Powers had foreseen the deadly quarrels which would so soon divide them! There are two reasons for this. One is the reluctance of all the Great Powers—and not only of Russia—to abandon any part of their sovereignty and to submit their fate to the votes of other nations. The second is a virtual doubt as to whether the principle of collective security can be successfully applied to the Great Powers at all.

The idea of collective security is simple and, in theory, convincing. It is that peace is the ultimate end of all government that is indivisible and that any threat to one nation is a threat to all. If every nation, therefore, binds itself in advance to stand by the victim of aggression and to resist the aggressor by force, their united strength will be overwhelming. No nation, it is agreed, not even the strongest, can stand alone against the world in arms.

On the whole, however, experience suggests that once a nation achieves an excess of power in a certain area, its small neighbors will not resist it if they can avoid doing so, and the threat of collective action from the rest of the world is too remote and uncertain to deter it from going to war if there is a determined attack. Moreover, war is such a serious gamble, especially when the Big Powers are involved, that no nation will bind itself in advance to fight unless it feels itself vitally affected or threatened.

At San Francisco, therefore, the Big Powers—rightly or wrongly—decided that there were practical limits to collective security, that a Big Power could not be deterred from war by vague threats of collective action, and that the only thing to do was to hope for the best and trust to the unity and confraternity of the Allies. For lesser nations they prescribed collective security; for themselves they preferred consultation and conference. The result was unfair, no doubt, but it was not without practical wisdom.

As it stands today, the United Nations is a nucleus of Great Powers hopefully superimposed on a framework of collective security.

Now that, due to certain dramatic turns of events in the political affairs of the day, these hopes have been considerably shaken and the assumptions proved mistaken, are we to abandon the United Nations as useless? The United Nations—granted that it is a disappointment to many or that it cannot even prevent war at present—is still of supreme value as a safety valve, being the ultimate link between the East and the West. It might yet be used to avoid a final breakdown in Germany; to give the diplomats more time and an opportunity to continue negotiation whether the issue is the Cease-Fire in the Korean War or the deadlock in the "Kashmir issue."

In the Assembly and in all of its subsidiary organizations this instills the habit of conference and cooperation between nations, which may be more important than it seems! The most probable development, one feels, is that the nations will seek their security less in the United Nations than in regional agreements or alliances within the United Nations. This is permitted by the Charter and is the declared aim of the United Kingdom and the United States governments. The United Nations will continue as it is, but with more emphasis on the so-called subsidiary organizations, such as the Social and Economic Council, and less, perhaps, on the Security Council. Indeed, the past few years' experience confirms the view that the Security Council and the Assembly will still play a vital part as a semi-permanent international conference, as a sounding board for statesmen—a forum of negotiation, where charges or distortions are held answerable, where violations of treaty obligations must meet the verdict of world opinion, and where those responsible must answer for their conduct.

The one doubt that arises is whether the system of voting is altogether suitable for this purpose.

It is a fact that before 1914 it never occurred to

statesmen that sovereign nations should vote at international conferences or that the minority would be bound by the decision of the majority. Governments tried to find some common basis of agreement by means of bargaining and concession; and, if they could not, they agreed to differ. Even when the Covenant of the League of Nations was drafted in 1919, the idea seemed so revolutionary that all important questions required a unanimous vote; that is to say, every nation—and not only the Big Powers—had the right of veto. Indeed, while the conception of decisions by the majority vote is the most revolutionary aspect of the United Nations, the question may be asked: Is it wise?

It is admittedly based on the theory of equality of sovereign nations, a respectable moral and philosophical foundation that lays down a sound-working rule for political action. But in practice the idea seems a bit paradoxical, for what justice is expected to be found in making the vote of the Soviet Union, with its population of about 170 million equivalent to that of the Indian Republic with about 336 million heads; or with Panama, having about 600,000 population strength? Surely, if we are to have voting at all, should not States be given a varying number of votes according to the size of their population, industrial development, the contribution they are prepared to make to an international force, and so on? Such a formula may not altogether be impossible of being worked out by the United Nations, sponsored and ushered into being as it was by the great lover of Democracy, Franklin D. Roosevelt at Dumbarton Oaks in 1944.

The United Nations must, if it is to fulfill its purpose, be able to protect small nations from the threat of big ones. But, then, it should not be asked to adjudicate between rival claims without a genuine effort by the disputants at compromise! Admittedly, therefore, would it not be unwise at this critical phase of world history to insist too much on votes and vetoing, and to overstrain the United Nations by asking it to decide on every dispute? If it is certain that the United Nations as at present constituted cannot prevent war, it is equally certain it can substantially change the climate of opinion and wipe out the vital differences which formerly divided nations almost irreconcilably. So, no wonder, that India—a Charter Member of the United Nations—has continued to participate actively in the work of the organization and to utilize its resources fully for the settlement of international disputes, as well as for economic and social purposes. Indeed, she has looked upon cooperation within the United Nations as one of the most potent means of raising the living standards and of achieving economic betterment, particularly in the still undeveloped or underdeveloped countries of Asia and Africa. And, surely, India's election to the Security Council is an index of her growing prestige and the notable part she has played at international conferences during the fifth year of her independence. Her decision, again on her own initiative, to accept the two United Nations Resolutions on Korea was made to make the aggressor feel the weight of world opinion in strict conformity with the policy of the United Nations, which she has always meant to pursue, rather than being involved in power politics!

Among the resolutions adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in the plenary session at Flushing Meadow on December 14, 1950, the following excerpts are pertinently worthy of a reference, for our comparative study:

> The Security General is requested to impress upon the group of experts to be appointed by him under the UN Economic and Social Council the necessity of giving consideration to ways and means of preventing aggravation of the problem of unemployment or under-employment in the less developed nations, which might occur as a result of mechanization in certain branches of industry and agriculture, and to assure social security designed to insure the workers against temporary unemployment particularly in India and the Far East.

This obviously confirms the view that the United Nations has long anticipated such a growing menace, and has declared more than once that it is of utmost importance that even for the purpose of dealing with the threat of Communist World Conquest the underdeveloped countries, particularly those of the Far East, should have their industry and agriculture properly developed. Such an idea actually takes concrete shape as from December 13, 1950, when Dr. Henry G. Bennett, making his first historic appearance as an Administrator of the United States Point Four Technical Cooperation Program, declared, *inter alia:*

> Military rearmament is an unhappy necessity; economic development is not only a necessity but a great and inspiring opportunity. It is an opportunity to sow the seeds of democracy among people who no longer accept poverty, disease, and ignorance as inevitable facts of life.

Indeed, the Point Four Aid may be characterized as being "no less powerful and no less essential" for national survival than military supremacy, because of its great bearing upon the economic strategy of the underdeveloped nations. Under this miracle-aid, the $190 million India Emergency Food Aid Act, passed in June, 1951, by the United States Congress, India, it may be mentioned, has "thirty-five years in which to pay for the grain. Thus, the government of India has not had to deplete the funds urgently needed at home, to carry out the nation's economic development program-aim at ultimate self-sufficiency in food." (*American Reporter,* August 20, 1952.)

It is also pertinent to refer to the epoch-making program based on the Indo-American *entente cordiale,* which was ushered into India in January of 1952, under the Technical Cooperation Agreement, which enables India to undertake development of river-valley projects, malaria control, afforestation, and desert research, amongst other vital matters of national interests. Highly important for an agricultural country like hers, with a rapidly growing population, is the river-valley program. Under this agreement, TCA has provided technical assistance, equipment, and supplies to assist in the construction of the dams, irrigation canals, and the power plants, as the case may be, in four of India's river-valley schemes now under way in the Five-Year Plan, namely, Hirakund, Kakarpur, Mahi, and Chataprabha.

Besides the above, this Development Program has already started the Community Planning work, dating from October of 1952. Surely, this is not only a great humanitarian campaign but really in essence a "war on famine," as it was so magnificently described by Pundit Nehru in a pithy phrase, on the occasion of launching this epic battle against starvation, disease, drought, flood, and disaster—to which this sub-continent has been terribly subject throughout the past.

How far has the Aid contributed to the present time towards promoting the Indo-American good will and understanding? Surely, a tour into the heart of Indian villages—now, only eight and a half years after India's independence—must needs bring warm assurance that great days are coming; and that India, which counts its

eternal traditions in centuries, has unfalteringly struck a posture of progress for all the world to see! From the rolling foothills of the Himalayas to the palm-beaches of Travancore—the villages for which Mahatma Gandhi expressed his lifelong concern, namely "if the villages perish, India perishes too"—now appear to be on the move under the massive Community Development Program, which had its fitting inception on his birthday under its guiding light. And, what wonder, in three short years the plan is now at work in more than 100,000 villages across the ancient land, with 75 million active beneficiary-participants! "In support of all phases of India's above progress, the people of the United States have subscribed, through their government and private sources, a total of more than half a billion dollars." (*American Reporter,* February 1, 1956.)

Is it, then, an investment, as some glum critics may opine with an ulterior motive, namely of some "strings" tied somewhere underneath? Indeed, the Aid, we must candidly admit, is an investment—an investment in terms of the right recognition of the "dignity of man" of a great people by another great people. To confirm it one needs only look at what the Indian villages have so far achieved. It is a fact that the most heartening statistic of the progress has been due to the villagers themselves, whose voluntary contribution in land, labor, cash, and kind, has appeared to swell to sixty percent of the total government outlay! The opportunity under the Aid, to build their own future, has truly inspired them, and no doubt almost anywhere now they can be seen in the countryside thinking and working together. Does it not portend, therefore, that despite the spook of the "string-complex maniacs," villages of the once "cradle of civilization, India" are inevitably on the move and that hope bestirs anew for about one-sixth of mankind?

Thus, tremendous political, economic, and social issues are simultaneously co-related with one another in such organized onslaughts on hunger—the "Great Bolshevik Agent"—as have been sponsored by the great minds and the hands of the United Nations. Can anybody deny that victory in this vital conflict would surely elevate India to a position of leadership in Asia? Herein lies, to some extent, therefore, the answer on an inevitable point at issue.

It might be relevant to recall the following lines, written by Benjamin Franklin, from Paris on May 1, 1777:

> . . . . Our cause is the cause of all mankind and we are fighting for their liberty in defending our own. It is a glorious task assigned us by Providence, which has, I trust, given us spirit and virtue equal to it, and will at last crown it with success.

Surely such a hope appears to have found, at long last, a visible embodiment in the United Nations Charter.

And if the United Nations, as the critics sometimes opine, cannot prevent war, say, in the foreseeable future among the Big Powers, has any other organization been able to prevent war in the past?

The Ethical Culture Movement

LEO HIRSCH

With its deep roots in the past, the Ethical Culture Movement was founded by Professor Felix Adler eighty years ago. At first he taught religious history and oriental literature at Cornell University. And for a great many years he taught political and social science at Columbia University. He was chosen by President Theodore Roosevelt as exchange professor to the University of Berlin. He established the first free kindergarten system in New York City and the first public kindergarten west of the Mississippi. He was chairman of the National Child Labor Committee from its inception, which performed the vital function of limiting child labor in many of our states. He founded the Ethical Culture School in New York City: the outgrowth of the Workingmen's School. He tried to bring to the fore the importance of teaching our youth the social sciences and the humanities, because he believed that the study of these sciences and the results derived therefrom, if once universally applied, would eliminate the bitter hatreds and conflicts that now rage all around us. The response to his teachings was immediate and quite remarkable. Young men of all religions were drawn to him, some of whom became leaders of our different Societies when they were formed.

The first book that he wrote was characteristically entitled *Creed and Deed,* because he believed that it was the deed which clearly revealed those things that the individual prized in his innermost nature, rather than the lip service that he paid to his creed.

One might ask at this point whether the Ethical Movement is a religious movement. I would definitely say "Yes." We officiate at marriages, funerals, at births; we hold our Sunday morning meetings as other religious organizations do, but without any of the traditional ceremonies, although retaining the uniting force of music. We generally have one of our leaders discuss an ethical problem or have some outside person who has made a contribution to human relations. We also have many group activities which include adult education and recreational facilities for the aging.

It is a difficult religion to follow and apply because, first of all, it is a religion of action. We believe that, if there are needed reforms in our cities, in our states or internationally, something ought to be done about them. We believe that you cannot have any freedom in any area of human activity, be it religious, political, or economic, unless there exists a profound feeling of moral responsibility on the part of the men and women who form these groups. There were certain incidents in the Eisenhower administration that clearly showed that there are men in high office who believe in the double standard. It is therefore also a religion of duty with the emphasis placed on moral responsibility.

Ethical Religion is a far higher and deeper concept than the belief in a particular creed. We feel that it is possible to be a deeply religious person without subscribing to any creed, just as we know that it is possible to be an irreligious person by taking hold of the form and missing the meaning and content of religion. We are of the conviction that all religions may agree with each other on the underlying truth that is common to all religions and that unites more fundamentally than the religious differences that divide us. Hence, an indi-

vidual who has this larger concept of religion, who earnestly seeks the common factor of all religions, who does not look upon any one religion to dominate all the rest, and who does not look upon the Scriptures of any one religion as holding the key to the last and final truth of the universe: such a person lays firmly the foundation to real religious unity as distinguished from uniformity.

The great truth that Dr. Adler saw with such remarkable clarity and courage was the existence of a humanly ineradicable evil, the inescapable frustration of our mortal finitude and imperfection which make our search for happiness so pathetically vain. Neither in love nor in our labors, neither in society nor in solitude, neither in the arts nor in the sciences will this world of actuality permit us to win perfection. So that under this blighting fire the flower of our hopes most often wither and the fruits of our efforts are never wholly free from the canker of disappointment and disillusionment.

Dr. Adler was too enlightened to share the orthodox belief that this atrocious evil of life can be compensated in some hereafter. He was too honest a thinker to believe that by a few mechanical inventions or by the application of new sources of power (we are witnessing today the emergence of atomic power; shortly we will be able to harness solar power) or by a politico-economic change *a la* Marx, which is the heart and core of Communist ideology, we can create a heaven on this earth and be happy forever after.

It seems to me that we know little about the condition of our own happiness and stilll less of what would make others happy. According to Dr. Adler, this atrocious evil of life can be transcended if we make it the condition of the recognition to take ourselves in hand and make of ourselves dynamic centers of spiritual influence and inspiration. Thus the arrows of misfortune can become the beams of spiritual light that will penetrate the dark clouds of our mortal existence. Thus history may come to mean not what Spengler believed it to mean: despair, but the wisdom of living and working together with the imperfect and, above all, the lessening of those fierce fanaticisms and conflicts that now rage all about us.

The Ethical Movement is definitely a movement, in contrast to the churches and synagogues that are still static and rigid and inflexible in their doctrines. Hence the Ethical Movement constantly seeks new truth, new enlightenment, clearer vision, and greater fulfillment. The Ethical Movement has a backward as well as a forward look. We realize that we are passing through an age of transition, and the break with the past has been abrupt and very harsh. The new generation believes that wisdom is born with it, and that it is called to the business of experience and thinking utterly anew, completely discarding the wisdom gained in the past ages. Due to this sharp break with the past, we have sustained a serious loss in our right thinking and attitude toward authority, which basically means creativeness, that originality which elicits originality in others. The past is peopled with such great personalities of influence.

It is generally conceded that the masses of humans throughout the ages, including our own, have been burden bearers with their eyes to the ground, but the outstanding thinkers and teachers, the great Greeks, the Hebrew prophets, the masters of art and science, these still radiate tremendous spiritual power, if we but turn to them. It seems to me that the new generation is sadly impoverished if it does not put itself in contact with these personalities: discarding them at its own peril. The remarkable mentality of Aristotle, the ethical vigor of Socrates, the spiritual genius of Jesus represent the upward surge of mankind to ever higher levels of thinking and living. And as we live up to their ideals, we will find our lives charged with new meaning and importance. This does not require any supernatural revelation, for these forces are implicit in the hearts and minds of men and women. We admit that we inherit from all religions, but we boldly look to men to add new insights to truth, goodness, and beauty.

Thus it is the ever higher manifestations of spiritual power that is the new religious objective of the Ethical Movement. We no longer look on man in the Puritan sense of a fallen creature but an individual who has the ability to conceive ideals and acknowledge their authority. We ought to recognize that we are but at the beginning of civilization, but a mere step or two away from the cave man with his hungers, fears, passions and hatreds, but a mere inch along the yardstick of human progress.

The promise of possibility is simply vast. The call of creativeness today is utterly different from the Puritan's joylessness of life with its bourgeois morality of repression or somnolent ease. The Ethical Movement calls its members to the business of ethical purpose and effort, always motivated to ennoble and enrich life and human relations: thus making society more efficient, winning a greater self-respect and a more genuine unselfishness. The Ethical Movement calls its members to transform the stature of other people, for it is only by doing so that we can improve the stature of ourselves. It is by these means that the old idea and definition of power is completely transformed, for spiritual power manifests itself only to uplift, to reeducate, revitalize human life.

The Ethical Movement has made so many valuable contributions to modern society that it is impossible to adequately appraise all of them in one article. So I deemed it necessary to select four outstanding contributions.

1. One of the most important contributions of our society has been to strengthen and deepen our belief in religious freedom, the granting to every individual the right to worship according to his own intellectual capacity and his own grasp of the universe and godhead. So we must revere the wisdom of the founding fathers who incorporated this freedom into our Constitution. Since the lamp of reason has been lit in man's brain he has become aware and conscious of two realities: (a) The first reality is that there exists in this universe a power greater than ourselves out of which we emerged. We are children of this universe. (b) The second reality is that man's mind is too weak to grasp, understand, or define this ultimate source of life. The perennial questions are always with us: who put the stars in the sky, what makes the sun rise, what makes us living, breathing, conscientious human beings, who performed that miracle of miracles which no Scriptures record, the transformation of the inorganic into the organic? No one can answer these questions, not even the foremost scientists. The poet expresses man's inability to define the infinite, viz.: Alfred Tennyson, in the poem:

> Flower in the crannied wall,
> I pluck you out of the crannies,
> I hold you here, root and all, in my hand,
> Little flower—but if I could understand
> What you are, root and all, and all in all,
> I should know what God and man is.

The physicist has even greater difficulty to define this infinite power. The nearest to a definition came from the mind of Prof. Albert Einstein when he stated: "The more I explore the unknown, the more I dig into the mysteries of life and the universe, the more I am convinced that the power behind the universe is spiritual in its nature."

The astronomer informs us frankly that the mind is too weak to grasp this vast universe in its many ramifications. Man can grasp one solar system with the sun in the center and the satellite planets revolving around it. But when it comes to entering one solar system after another (and there are millions upon millions of these solar systems) then the mind becomes confused and disconnected. Man can grasp a chariot drawn by a two-horse team, a four-horse team, an eight-horse team, but he cannot grasp a chariot drawn by a hundred horses and still less a million horses in an orderly fashion. However, man has easily grasped a charioteer within this chariot, holding within his hands the reins of power. So the God concept is like the charioteer concept; this universal power guiding this vast immensity by means of law, order, truth, goodness, and beauty and yet permitting the co-existence of evil and destructiveness, thus challenging man to turn to truth and goodness.

So the Ethical Movement, in view of the unknown and man's inability to penetrate it, has emphasized the primary thing to be the fulfilling of our duty in that circle of human relationships without which life is meaningless. We respect man's attitude toward the unknown but we emphasize that we are more interested in this man whom we met today; what kind of a husband he is or father or brother or son; what kind of an employer he is; does he do justice to the worker; what kind of employee is he; does he give a full day's work for a full day's pay; does he take pride and time in performing his civic duties; does he involve himself in that larger whole which we call society?

2. The second important contribution has been that we have emphasized the imperative need of respecting other people's differences, differing viewpoints and differing decisions. Here again we must pay our respects to the wisdom of the founding fathers for having incorporated into our Constitution freedom of speech, freedom of discussion, and freedom of elections. The moment we eliminate these freedoms we immediately destroy democracy and the democratic way of life. We see this lack of freedom in the totalitarian states where the voter is handed a sealed envelope that he dare not open and which he places in the ballot box, thus perpetuating his tyrannical rulers.

It is only through intelligent discussion that there emerges at times flashes of truth and light that otherwise could not be created. It would be an intolerable world indeed if the challenge of differences did not exist. It is our conviction that the more mature a person becomes intellectually and spiritually the more he has the ability to put himself into another person's mental state and grasp his angle of truth, because it is only by this means that he can validate his own angle of truth. Whether the Ethical Movement becomes world-wide, large or small, it must continue to emphasize freedom of speech, freedom of discussion, and freedom of elections. The old orthodox idea that there are a few torchbearers to the inner shrine is no longer relevant or applicable to a democratic society.

3. The third unique contribution to modern society was when the Ethical Movement clarified to a confused and divided world the meaning of ethics and the meaning of religion. We do not agree with traditional religion that ethics is a mere ingredient or by-product of religion and that it cannot be taught without embedding it in theology and dogma. Ethics is the science of conduct and the art of life. It is a study of what constitutes right human relations. Here the recognition of a common good, a commonwealth in which each person has an equal worth with every other, is the only moral attitude. "Be a person and respect the personality of others." This is our duty in the human sphere. When we have ascertained what the right relationship ought to be, then our conscience begins to apply the result of our study. This study and this application are the very things that make religion worth-while and are of supreme importance to society.

Kant has expressed the principle of ethics in the form of a maxim: "Treat humanity, whether in thyself or in others, always as an end, never as a means." The temptation to treat others merely as tools to minister to our gratification, or as obstacles to be pushed out of our pathway is very strong. What makes us treat people in that way is our failure to enter into their lives, to see things as they see them, and to feel things as they feel them. The realization of the good of all, in and through the act of each, is the social ideal and the basis of ethics.

Religion to us is basically the same as the Latin word: *religio*—a force that binds and unites and is not divisive. We do not agree with traditional religion that religion is something fixed for all time, rigid, inflexible, unchangeable. Religion to us is like the universe, like society, in constant flux, change, growth, and development. It is an organism in growth that demands constant reexamination and reinterpretation according to the needs of the time. Hence religion as presented here is the consummation rather than the foundation of ethics. The heart and core of religion therefore is the ethical conduct undertaken by free men and women who are dedicated to doing the right as they see the right. If traditional religion could free itself from its theologies and dogmas and devote itself to the actual needs of actual men and women in actual life situations, it would become the greatest force for righteousness on this earth.

The Ethical Movement believes that we need more light and truth than the traditional religions offer us. Something vital must be lacking in the old religions if they have thus far failed to curb the spirit of war, to curb the blood lust. They have also failed to bring justice into our economic system. We admit that there are kernels of truth in the old religions but we also admit that they are inadequate today and must be broadened. Ethical religion must not be like the Jewish religion: emphasizing the exemplariness of one people, of one nation, and it must not be like the traditional religion of Christendom: emphasizing the exemplariness of one person. Exemplariness is a help to a certain degree but beyond that it is an injury, because no personality, no individual, can exemplify in himself the different aspects of human nature, the different qualities, the different perfections.

4. The fourth contribution was made when Dr. Adler had the moral courage against the strongest opposition to incorporate into the curriculum of the Ethical Culture school the teaching of ethics, the greatest of the social sciences. This was done without violating the doctrine of the separation of Church and State. He believed that it was important to teach these basic human relations to our boys and girls from the kinder-

garten up. This would educate them to the fact of moral responsibility, not only to the members of their own family but to the members of that larger family which we call society. If this were done in our homes, in our schools, in our religious institutions, there would be less crime and delinquency. Since his introduction of this innovation, other progressive schools followed his lead. It aroused the interest of educators the world over, many of whom visited our schools to study our method. We continue to welcome modern-minded educators, so that this plan may be extended throughout the world.

The New Piety

GEORGE LAWRENCE PARKER

At the 1955 Summer Convocation of the Harvard Divinity School, Professor John B. Dillenberger, Associate Professor of Theology, sounded out one of the most arresting challenges to our changing times. He boldly summoned not only the theological schools but the churches and the public mind to a "New Piety."

In essence, he declared that our "old piety," as solid as many of its foundations may be, is not effective enough to meet or control mankind in our present conditions of thought and historical circumstances. His plain implication is that a great deal of our current religious thinking and feeling is unfitted for the strain now put upon them, as Old Dobbin, the family horse, is unfitted for plodding along on our superhighways. In detail Dr. Dillenberger bids the theological schools to dismiss all creedal and denominational emphasis and to teach spiritual truth wherever truth may be found in all or any of the fields where human life inevitably comes face to face with its inescapable realities, longings, and hungers of the soul.

Dr. Dillenberger suggests or plainly says that the new piety will cast aside all such terms as the conflict between science and religion, competitive sectarianism, dogmatic explanations that explain nothing, and spiritual loyalties that rest wholly on tradition. Doubtless, change just for the sake of change is not the basis for the new piety but change for the sake of growth, development, and stature-reaching progress is the center and heart of religious faith: the chief authority for such a statement being the words of Jesus, "The Scribe instructed in the Kingdom of Heaven bringeth forth out of his treasure things *old and new*." And the Book of Hebrews opens the gate into truth even more widely in its famous definition, "Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen."

The new piety recognizes no such status as a *status quo*. The very essence of truth and faith in all ages has been man's pressure toward the novelties of his spiritual existence. The magnetic pull of the future is not the private property of science, nor of philosophy, nor even of poetry. The magnetic pull of the future has its chief dynamic power in the reciprocal gestures that the idea of God makes toward man and that man makes toward God. In the midst of all changes the word of Goethe repeats itself, "Thus at the loom of time I ply and weave for God the garment thou seest Him by." And less than a hundred years ago James Russell Lowell, a practical New Englander wrote, "We cannot unlock the future with the past's dull rusted key."

Yet, in the main, it is just this dull rusted key method of religious reality that we are using today. We have very recently heard that trips to the moon will be possible in less than fifty years, and that the laboratories are even suggesting that, sooner or later, we shall create a new man-made sun in the heavens. In the midst of changes that appear to challenge our basic sanity, the modern man finds himself lost in a wondering confusion or a benumbing silence. He is frightened by the weight and the tremendousness of his own existence. This fright of ours is not entirely new in man's experience, but by our methods of quick and sudden communication we get the impact of it all at once and it overwhelms us like an avalanche.

If there is to be a new piety, it must implement itself by terms and actual instrumentalities fitted and suited to the future and not restricted to the past. A modern prophet has said that "all that we need from the past is our capacity to make a future out of it."

Such implementation will consist, first, in a new view of the Bible and of the Sacred Scriptures of all nations and all faiths. Each and all of these Bibles will be reverenced as the undertones of man's search for truth, but not revered as completed or final definitions of truth. Second, the new piety will recognize and practice the new unity that prevails, and that unity will encompass the mind and spirit. It will not be confined to inventions nor material conveniences. Third, the new piety will place genuine mysticism in the forefront of its motive powers. We cannot move forward without the constant urgency of our undefined hungers. Fourth, the new piety will rewrite democracy not in terms of formal international agreements but in terms of man's value to God as well as God's value to man.

The practical list of our instrumentalities and "know hows" of the new piety is an endless one. Its activities will be far greater than we have yet dreamed of. The challenge of it to our whole intellectual constitution is the brightest ray of hope on the horizon and that ray of hope can and must be harnessed and set to work by every religious and every educational tool in our present possessions, including not only the churches but the colleges and universities, for, after all, the new piety has but one message: the cohesion, unity, and significance of all our fragmented pasts. Our total humanity is far greater than the sum of its parts. The piety of the future must be an assembly line for every item of man's varied consciousness.

Western Unitarian Conference

700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois
RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary

HILTON RESIGNS

Dear Friends: In May, 1943, at the Western Unitarian Conference Annual Meeting, held at the Third Unitarian Church of Chicago, I was elected to the position of Secretary of the Conference and Board. I moved my family to Chicago and assumed the executive functions of the office on January 1, 1944.

During the thirteen years, plus, I have tried, to the best of my ability, to give efficient and constructive service to the Conference. As in any position there have been problems. However, I have an overall sense of satisfaction which far outweighs any and all of the difficulties. A record of some of the accomplishments of the Conference during these years is contained in my report to the last Annual Meeting. There is no need to repeat them here.

The Western Conference has always stood for progressive religion and for its practical application. One of the outstanding institutional expressions of this practical, humanized religion is the Abraham Lincoln Centre of Chicago. Founded by a Unitarian church and Jenkin Lloyd Jones, its minister and former Secretary of the Western Unitarian Conference, it has been presided over for the past thirty years by Curtis W. Reese, also a former Secretary of the Conference. Following Dr. Reese's announcement of his impending retirement the Board of the Centre offered the position of Dean, its executive director, to me. Believing thoroughly in the principles upon which Lincoln Centre was founded, and upon which it has operated during the past fifty-one years, I decided to accept. This provides for me the opportunity to carry out in specific and practical ways the principles I have tried to augment through organizational procedures and structure.

Thus it is with regret, and yet with enthusiasm for the future, that I present my resignation as Secretary of the Western Unitarian Conference to take effect at midnight, February 14, 1957. I promise you my continued support and loyalty, and hope that the Conference will give its loyal support to Abraham Lincoln Centre.

I want to express my sincere appreciation and heartfelt thanks to you who have been so devoted to the Conference and have made my task so enjoyable and rewarding.

Sincerely,
Randall S. Hilton, Secretary.

THEY LOOKED TO THE FUTURE

Mr. Hilton informed the Conference Executive Committee in June of his impending resignation. A special Advisory Committee of the Board was appointed to recommend a successor to Mr. Hilton. The committee was composed of Rev. E. T. Buehrer, Chairman; Mrs. Christian Andreason, Dr. Thaddeus B. Clark, and Charles W. Phillips. This committee made its recommendations to the Board at its meeting on October 1st. The Board then, in compliance with the By-laws and the laws of the state of Illinois under which it is incorporated, elected Rev. Ellsworth Smith to fill the vacancy for the remainder of the Secretary's term, which runs until the Annual Meeting of 1959.

MEET THE SECRETARY-ELECT

Ellsworth M. Smith, who has completed eight years as minister of the First Unitarian Church of Cincinnati, has been elected by the Board of Directors to be the new Executive Secretary of our Western Conference, to succeed Randall S. Hilton on February 15, 1957.

Mr. Smith, or Ellsworth, as all his fellow-ministers call him, is exceptionally well-qualified to measure up to his new responsibilities. He received his B.A. and M.A. degrees at Colgate University, and his B.D. at Andover-Newton Theological Seminary. Reversing the usual procedure of beginning as a settled minister and graduating at last into administrative service, he began almost immediately with various administrative responsibilities which led at last to the Unitarian ministry. Early in his career he was a member of a staff of three ministers who were in charge of six churches. Following this experience he returned to Andover-Newton as a teacher of rural church methods and rural sociology, with supervision over students and ministers working with rural churches. He was also charged with important public relations responsibilities, working closely with both the Baptist and Congregational denominations. It was during this time that he wrote a manual of rules and procedures which attracted considerable attention, and was widely used in other denominations. In this capacity, too, he had considerable experience in ministerial placement.

For the next two years Ellsworth was field representative in the Town and Country Department of the American Baptist Home Missionary Society, placing special emphasis on the work of the churches in rural communities. Later he joined the Conference of Southern Mountain Workers at Berea College, and following this experience he became Director of War Emergency Services of the Detroit Council of Churches. Here he helped coordinate the work of twenty-three denominations in finding and accepting their share of responsibility to a half-million new people who had been converging upon Detroit. It was during this period that he helped found the interracial "Church of all Peoples," whose individual members were associates, retaining their primary membership in churches of many and varied denominations.

In 1948 Ellsworth moved to Cincinnati to become minister of our First Unitarian Church. Under his leadership the church has grown in numbers, effectiveness, and in financial strength. The budget has grown from $11,000 to almost $25,000; and he has led, in addition, a Capital Fund Drive to expand the facilities of his religious education program. The new educational building was dedicated this fall.

Ellsworth has a warm, friendly approach to people and to their problems. By temperament, training, and experience he comes to our Conference office well-prepared to face the many tasks and opportunities awaiting him. To him, his wife, Judy, and their daughter, Marilee, aged six, we offer our congratulations and our cordial welcome. We believe he will be a capable and efficient Secretary in a distinguished succession.

Edwin T. Buehrer, President,
Western Unitarian Conference

TREASURER RESIGNS

Dr. Curtis W. Reese, who has been serving as Treasurer of the Conference since January 1, 1954, presented his resignation to the Board on October 1st to take effect February 14th. The special committee to recommend the Secretary has been requested to make a recommendation to the Board (for a new Treasurer) at its January meeting.

Dr. Reese was Secretary of the Conference from 1919 to 1930, and President from 1939 to 1953.

1957 ANNUAL MEETING

The next Annual Meeting of the Western Unitarian Conference will be held April 26-28, 1957, at the First Unitarian Church of Ann Arbor, Michigan. The Ann Arbor congregation has recently moved into their new building. It is a modern structure of functional design. Those who saw the Madison church last spring will be especially interested in visiting the Ann Arbor church.

U.M.A.—W.U.C.

The Western Conference Branch of the Unitarian Ministers Association will hold its annual Institute on April 24-25, 1957, at Ann Arbor, as a pre-meeting to the Conference sessions.

NOMINATING COMMITTEE

At the Annual Meeting in Ann Arbor three members of the Conference Board are to be elected for terms of four years. The members whose terms expire are Dr. Arthur Foote, St. Paul; Mrs. Edgar G. Braun, Detroit; and Dr. Ralph Fuchs, Bloomington, Indiana. The Nominating Committee, consisting of one member each from the Board and the sub-regional areas, is composed, as of this date, of:

Dr. Arthur Foote, St. Paul, Chairman; 739 Portland Avenue, St. Paul 4, Minn.
Mr. Howard Custer, Madison, Wisconsin.
Mrs. John Ely, Jr., Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
Miss June Sark, Chicago, Illinois.
Rev. Harold H. Wright, Ft. Collins, Colorado.

Suggestions of names for consideration by the Nominating Committee should be sent to the chairman.

NOTA BENE

The By-laws of the Conference require that resolutions for consideration at the Annual Meeting must be submitted in writing to the Secretary sixty days prior to said meeting. Thus any member organization, or constituent thereof, must have any resolutions upon which they desire action in the hands of the Secretary not later than February 25, 1957.

NEW FELLOWSHIPS

Mr. Munroe Husbands, Director of Fellowships, has traveled through portions of the Western Conference this fall with the result that there is the possibility of having active fellowships in the following localities:

Janesville, Wisconsin.
Manitowoc, Wisconsin.
Sheboygan, Wisconsin.
Albert Lea, Minnesota.
Kankakee, Illinois.

If the fellowship growth continues, it will not be long until we have more fellowships than churches in the Western Conference. At the present time there are 58 churches, 46 fellowships, and two branch churches. These, plus the two institutions, Abraham Lincoln Centre and Meadville Theological School, make 106 member organizations of the Conference. This does not include the potential fellowships listed above, nor the branches which hold membership only as a part of the mother church.

GENEVA SLIDES

Two sets of color 2 x 2 slides of the Lake Geneva Summer Assembly are now ready for use. If your group wishes to borrow them, please write to the Conference office, giving the date you desire to use them. The office will try to schedule the slides to meet your convenience. These are exceptionally beautiful pictures taken by Mrs. Sidney Mead at last summer's conference.

FROM HERE AND THERE

Churches continue to expand their plants, building-fund campaigns abound, and fellowships look toward securing permanent homes. Among the latest of these is the Unitarian Fellowship of Carbondale, Illinois, which has just purchased the Carbondale City Library Building, expecting to move in on March 1, 1957. In the meantime they are renting the building to the library board.

From Cedar Rapids, Iowa, comes the good news: "This is the happiest announcement we have made in many years! With some people yet to be contacted and a few pledges not yet in, our building-fund campaign has climbed to the inspiring figure of $69,000. . . . The loyalty and generosity of the friends and members of the Peoples Church have made this campaign a great triumph and tribute.

"And here is surprising fact Number Two: We estimate the total cost of the campaign to be $32.00! This, our only expenditure, was for the purchase of weekly pledge envelopes."

A recent bulletin from Grosse Pointe, Michigan, carried the announcement of a series of eight lectures in Introductory Astronomy to be given by Rev. William D. Hammond under the auspices of the Department of Community Service of the Grosse Pointe Public School System. Recognizing 1957 as the year "man begins his invasion of space . . . with the launching of a small, man-made moon" it is felt that now "is the time to get ready for the age of space-travel."

Birmingham, Michigan, utilized its "turn" on a current radio series over WKHM to present "The Unitarian Church as a Layman's Church." Three-minute statements were made by Mr. Jack Gieck (President of the Men's Group), Mr. John Harrison, Jr. (a convert from orthodoxy), Mrs. Frances Robinson (a "born Unitarian") and Mrs. Jean Rosewig (Director of Religious Education).

The tremendous response in Cincinnati to the U.S.C.'s call for aid for Hungarian refugees resulted in the formation of an official Cincinnati Chapter of the Unitarian Service Committee. Several chains of cleaning establishments have offered to receive and clean bundles of clothing when designated for Hungarian relief. Laundry companies have formulated a pickup service. The materials are to be transported to the New York Warehouse free of charge by a freight forwarding service. Shipping cartons, posters, and advertising have also been donated, along with countless hours of volunteer service on the part of individuals. Yes, the city *does* have a heart!